A U M

The Self which is free from sin, free from old age, from death and grief, from hunger and thirst, which desires nothing but what it ought to desire and imagines nothing but what it ought to imagine, that it is which we must search out, which we must try to understand.—*Chandogya Upanishad.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. VII SEPTEMBER, 1919 No. 11

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

THE SPIRIT IN THE BODY*

For Spirit, when invested with matter or *prakriti,* experienceth the qualities which proceed from *prakriti;* its connection with these qualities is the cause of its rebirth in good and evil wombs. The Spirit in the body is called *Maheswara,* the Great Lord, the spectator, the admonisher, the sustainer, the enjoyer, and also the *Paramatma,* the highest soul.

—Bhagavad-Gita, Chapter XIII.

THERE is plenty of material, as well as help, in the devotional books, to the realization of the *heart doctrine,* for they are designed to awaken the Buddhic faculty—that of Intuition, the only means by which *light* can come to you or anyone. Printed words and the information that they indicate, are only "ladders" by which the learner can climb to Wisdom. Each one has to make his own connection with higher planes and Those who live in those higher realms. It has often been said that "when the materials are ready, the Architect will appear," so our work must be to get the material ready, and that means that we have to get rid of the purely personal bias by making Theosophy a living power in our lives. So long as we are working for some reward, are inclined to be despondent or impatient, we will be placing obstacles in our own way.

Read the Voice of the Silence and see the keys of the different "portals." *Dana,* the key of Charity; consideration for others, no matter what their state. *Shila,* the key of harmony in word and act; that means among other things, sincerity; not to let their acts belie their words, or their words, their acts. *Kshanti,* patience sweet that naught can ruffle. These three, if practised, will create a fairer

*From the Letters of Robert Crosbie. Here published for the first time.—EDITORS.

and clearer atmosphere. *Shila* counterbalances the cause and the effect and leaves no further room for karmic action. The same idea is set forth in the Gita where it says that "Freedom comes from a *renunciation of self-interest* in the results of our actions."

The question always is, "How will we stand the pressure?" Patience and fortitude are necessary under every condition. The ripening of one's Karma presents the opportunity to gain these qualities, and it is well that he should learn the lesson. The principal effect of Karma is mental and psychical. Family Karma is not our own, and will come about sooner or later. The same with difficult financial conditions, or any other hard circumstances; they will come to all. So we should strive for calmness, patience, and fortitude, and also have full confidence that the tide is bound to turn, even at the fifty-ninth minute of the eleventh hour. "If the candidate has faith, patience and confidence, verily he will not have to wait too long." There is one thing that should be remembered in the midst of all difficulties; it is this—"When the lesson is learned the necessity ceases."

We should know that Karma does not castigate, it simply affords the opportunity for adjustment. No one can precipitate our Karma upon us, nor would anyone wish to do so; so whatever happens it is well to remember that it was caused by ourselves, precipitated by ourselves, can be met by ourselves. So we must assure ourselves that nothing can posibly overwhelm us. It is better to assume a cheerful attitude and cultivate in one's self a feeling of confidence, and endeavor to impart it to our nearest. Our anxiety and inner fears, as well as our outward expression of them, may go a great way in depressing those who love us and whom we love.

We all get in that temporary state of loneliness, and it should be a matter of encouragement to us that we are not alone in reality, for we have company although we may not be aware of it in our momentary sense of personal isolation. There is a point in our progress which involves the passing from one state of thought and action into another, and knowing this, we should not be dismayed nor disturbed by anything that may come to pass. It may seem to you that you are now useless, and your future circumstances dark and foreboding. These are only shadows of the past cast on the screen of the present; like shadows they will pass, if you but recognize them for what they are.

Are you thinking too much of yourself, your present conditions and your prospects? This is not a firm reliance on the Law of your own being which brings to you the very opportunities that your soul progress needs. What if the future presents no clear view; what if the future is not clear; what if your desires are not fulfilled; what if your progress is not at all apparent—why worry about it? You cannot change it. All you can do is the best you can under existing circumstances, and *that is the very thing you should do,* dismissing from your mind all thought of those things which are not as you would have them.

Your studies and your efforts are futile if you are disturbed inwardly. The first thing then is to get calmness, and that can be reached by taking the firm position that nothing can really injure you, and that you are brave enough and strong enough to endure anything; also that it is a necessary part of your training. Mr. Judge once said, "it may be a child's school, but it takes a man to go through it." Then why not make up your mind to go through it, no matter what the circumstance or condition; others have; you can. Are you of weaker caliber than they?

The whole position of the sincere student is summed up in the words: "Hold on grimly; have confidence and faith; for faith in the Master will surely bring victory." We must "have *patience,* as one who doth forever more endure"—and *forget ourselves* in working for others.

THEOSOPHY AND ASCETICISM*

WHAT is the greatest delusion and what causes it? Always one thing: *relative* truth; and its cause is ignorance. There never was a religion, there never was a philosophy, but what embodied relative truth. It is this relative truth which confuses mankind. Men do not see that Truth is *one;* that truth agrees only with truth; that error disagrees with truth and disagrees with error.

Relative truth is the cause of man's becoming involved in a partial view of the universe and of himself. Each man tries to *segregate* truth, by looking only in some given direction. He thinks all is right on this side; all wrong on that. Thus each man makes his own limitations. We say, thus far shall we go, and no farther. As a man thinks, he becomes. If he thinks he is a poor miserable sinner, he certainly will not step beyond the limitation thus self-imposed, until he changes his fundamental ideas. We are always acting upon and affecting each other, in thought and action. So we get a consensus of ideas, and that consensus forms the general impression and the general limitation, of the individual, of a class of men, of mankind generally. This is the barrier that each has to overcome for himself if we are ever to get beyond personal or racial limitations.

Soul means experience. Our "soul" is all the experience we have gained that has brought us up to our present status. So what governs the man, and what governs mankind generally, is the idea and ideas held as to what life is and what the nature of man is. These ideas have differed at different times and among different

*From the stenographic report of a Talk by Robert Crosbie. Here published for the first time.—EDITORS.

peoples. We at the present time have ours. Our personal life, our social life, our civilization, have all arisen from the ideas we hold in regard to life. The real question should be with each one of us, Are those ideas true? Do they cover the whole ground? Are they susceptible of improvement? Have the results obtained through them been all that we could wish? What are our ideas of God, of Nature, of Man?

The religion we have nominally adopted has proved a failure. It has not changed human nature in any degree. The good by nature are good under this or any other religion. The bad by nature are bad, whether under our own or any other religion.

There is something wrong with our *basis* of thought and action, for we must remember that it is from our basis and habits of thought that our actions flow; if we have a true basis of thought, then we will certainly have right actions and practices.

Theosophy is not a religion, not a formula or dogma invented by man, but is, as a matter of fact, a statement of the Laws which govern the intellectual, the psychical, astral and physical constituents of man and of nature. It does not depend upon revelation or authority, but upon its inherent truth and the fact that its truth can be verified by every man for himself. The whole cry of Theosophy is to arouse man to an understanding of his own illimitable nature, so that he may know the action that is necessary to proceed along the truest and highest lines.

What has all this to do with Asceticism? Everything. Buddha was an Ascetic. Jesus was an Ascetic. So were the Founders of every great religion or philosophy. We do not hear from them insistence on this kind of food, or that kind of food; this kind of practice or that. From one and all of them we have these essential statements: Love one another; forgive your enemies; do good to them that despitefully use you and persecute you. Or again, William Q. Judge or H. P. Blavatsky—Do you think that they were ascetics, and if so, what kind?

They were ascetics in the truest sense. They never made any pretensions in their actions. They never said, Copy me. They always said, Do not follow me or my path; follow the path I show, the Masters who are behind.

They were ascetics and they had all the power which comes from true asceticism; not through refraining from or denying anything or anybody, but by the acceptance of all, the use of all. For everything in great nature of whatever kind, has been produced by the beings in the world, and is a natural evolution—everything. Where we have erred is in the improper use, the abuse of the very powers which we all possess. The most sacred of all our powers have been sacrificed on the altar of selfishness.

The true ascetic knows that. He knows that men have digged a pit for themselves by the very power of the Spirit which they are,

and that no one above us, however high, can remove men from the ditch they have digged but themselves.

Everyone has some idea as to what asceticism means. We know that monks and nuns have segregated themselves, withdrawn from the world and all participation in its affairs—and for centuries that was considered to be asceticism, and still is by many people.

It has been thought that asceticism consists in renouncing very many of the things that are used in the world. Some imagine that the eating of unaccustomed food is going to produce a spiritual effect; that through this relinquishment they are going to attain some spiritual advantage. The same is true with regard to many other practices.

Might we not well consider the motive of such practices? If one brought up in a certain way, accustomed to certain things, renounces them with the idea that thereby he is going to benefit by that relinquishment, there must be behind that intention and practice a selfish, personal desire. That selfish, personal desire could not by any possibility bring one to a state of enlightenment, regardless of what the practice might consist in.

If it be food we are thinking of, if we imagine that we will benefit spiritually by eating this and by not eating that, then food is all that we are considering. That is not high thinking, and the mere fact of thinking of one kind of food in preference to another will not lead to any development whatever. There are those who consider that a vegetarian diet, or a diet of nuts, cereals, or some other thing, rather than flesh, would be beneficial to them. Always to *them*. They forget that there are many peoples, the Hindus for instance, who do not eat flesh at all, and yet it cannot be said that the mass of Hindus are in any way spiritual in their development, or any great factors in the advancement of true civilization. We might consider also that animals, many of them, are very strict vegetarians; yet they are not especially spiritual.

It has many times been stated that true asceticism does not consist in the eating or non-eating of any kind of food whatever; nor in any practice whatever; nor in any posture whatever; but consists solely of *an attitude of mind*. Jesus said, To the pure all things are pure; and that was an occult statement, and has been many times repeated. So if we are come to consider asceticism we must look along other lines than those which have been so, unfortunately, generally accepted by people looking for knowledge.

The object of existence is to gain knowledge. The fact of existence as we find it, and our ideas as to what constitutes truth, have been brought about under law, by ourselves. Each one finds himself in that place, mentally as well as physically, which he has prepared for himself as a result of what he has thought and done in the past, in this and other lives. Our present and our future are also under law. Our present is mitigated, and the future may be entirely changed and corrected, by a right attitude toward all

things, asceticism included, and then by the right and full performance of duty—true asceticism—in the light of the perception of universal Truth.

A true ascetic is not one who cares whether he eats or doesn't eat, or what he eats; the manner of his incoming and outgoing concerns him but little; that he may be able in every action consonant with human life to do the right thing at the right time and in the right way is what concerns him all the time. He would look to the spirit of the action, and acting as spirit whatever he did in any direction would be for the great end in view, the benefit of all beings of every grade.

In the ancient teachings of the Upanishads a statement is made which we might consider. It is this, that "the work of the ascetic is neither pure nor dark, but is *peculiar to itself,* while that of other men is of three kinds." The three kinds of works alluded to in other men than the Ascetic are, first, purity in action and motive; second, dark, such as those of the infernal beings; and third, mixed, that of the general run of men, which are a mixture of pure and dark.

Jesus when he walked the earth was not particular as to what he should do, what he should eat, what he should drink, nor with whom he would associate. We might say with truth that he was an Ascetic, yet he never withheld himself from other men, never desired to do so. His aim was to benefit mankind, and he touched Humanity—his fellow-men—in every posible direction, wherever it was permitted. The true Ascetic must of necessity take that course. He is one who tries to get all the knowledge and all the power that he possibly can, in order that he may lay these at the feet of his fellow-men and do them service. There is nothing forbidden to him in the whole universe. With Saint Paul he will consider that now all things are lawful to him, but all things may not be expedient. He judges of the necessity of any action from the need of the case in hand, and finds that his hand is not stayed in any direction by any rules whatever, or any ideas that may prevail among the men of his time. Every great religious Teacher has come to break the molds of men's minds from the shackles of relative truth and false ideas as to man, nature and God.

We may dismiss from our minds all ideas of semi-starvation, all ideas of becoming something ourselves. That is something we ought to get deep in our hearts, deep into our natures—a perception of the selfishness of becoming something ourselves, of gaining anything for ourselves. What we ought to strive to do is to do the best we can in every direction for the sake of all others. In so doing we *are* what that doing procures: we strive not to become; we strive to do. There is nothing selfish, nothing personal, in that attitude and action. There is always the endeavor to use our very best knowledge and our very highest powers for the benefit of every other whom we may be able to touch.

How many of us have had other ideas? How many of us have considered that we may, by some practice or another, arrive at a stage far beyond our fellow-men? How much has that idea of stepping beyond our fellow-men weighed in our considerations in taking such steps? If it has so weighed, we have made a mistake, an error, at the very beginning, and the future must bear for us very many disappointments.

The world to each of us is what we make it. What we get out of the world is what we put into it. We cannot get anything else. The world stands to us according to the quality of our attitude towards it, according to the ideas we hold in regard to it. Do we not know that our minds are simply bundles of ideas; many of them false, many of them relative, erroneous—perhaps most of them? We cherish them, look through them, act in accordance with them. Do we not see how needful it is that these brain minds of ours should have a true conception of man's nature, so that by thinking and acting in accord with true conceptions that brain will gradually respond to the real nature of the man himself—Man the Spiritual Being? Then he will not need to know; he will not need anyone to tell him; he will not care what religions and practices have been, are now; or ever will be; for he will know in himself, of himself and for himself his own nature and the nature of every other being.

FROM THE SECRET DOCTRINE*

* * * There is no purely *mythical* element in any of the ancient religious texts; but the mode of thought in which they were originally written has to be found out and closely adhered to during the process of interpretation. For, it is either symbolical (archaic mode of thought), emblematical (a later though very ancient mode of thought), parabolical (allegory), hieroglyphical, or again *logogrammical*—the most difficult method of all, as every letter, as in the Chinese language, represents a whole word. Thus, almost every proper name, whether in the Vedas, the "Book of the Dead," or the Bible (to a degree), is composed of such logograms. No one who is not initiated into the mystery of the occult religious logography can presume to know what a name in any ancient fragment means, before he has mastered the meaning of every letter that composes it. How is it to be expected that the merely profane thinker, however great his erudition in *orthodox* symbolism, so to say—*i. e.*, in that symbolism which can never get out of the old grooves of Solar-myth and sexual-worship—shall penetrate into the arcana behind the veil?

*From the Original Edition, Vol. II, p. 335; see Third Edition, Vol. II, p. 350.

OCCULT OR EXACT SCIENCE?*

II. (*Concluded*)

IN a literary cross-firing that happened some years ago between two eminent professors, much was said of that now for ever famous fourth dimension. One of them, telling his readers that while he accepted the possibility of only the "terrestrial natural sciences," viz., the direct or inductive science, "or the exact investigation of those phenomena only which take place in our *earthly conditions of space and time,*" says he can never permit himself to overlook the possibilities of the future. "I would remind my colleagues," adds the Professor-Spiritualist, "that our inferences from that which is already acquired by investigation, must go a great deal further than our sensuous perceptions. The limits of sensuous knowledge must be subjected to constant enlargement, and those of deduction still more. Who shall dare to draw those limits for the future? . . . existing in a three dimensional space, we can conduct our investigations of, and make our observations upon, merely that which takes place within those three dimensions. But what is there to prevent us thinking of a space of higher dimensions and building a geometry corresponding to it? . . . Leaving the reality of a fourth dimensional space for the time being aside, we can still . . . go on observing and watching whether there may not be met with occasionally on our three-dimensional world, phenomena that could only be explained on the supposition of a four-dimensional space." In other words, "we ought to ascertain whether anything pertaining to the four-dimensional regions can manifest itself in our three-dimensional world . . . can it not be reflected in it . . . ?"

The occultist would answer, that our senses can most undeniably be reached on this plane, not only from a four-dimensional but even a fifth and a sixth dimensional world. Only those senses must become sufficiently *spiritualised* for it in so far as it is our inner sense only that can become the medium for such a transmission. Like "the projection of an object that exists in a space of three dimensions can be made to appear on the flat surface of a screen of only two dimensions"—four-dimensional beings and things can be reflected in our three-dimensional world of gross matter. But, as it would require a skilful physicist to make his audience believe that the things "real as life" they see on his screen are not shadows but realities, so it would take a wiser one than any of us to persuade a man of science—let alone a crowd of scientific men—that what he sees reflected on our three-dimensional "screen" may be, at times, and under certain conditions a very real phenomenon, reflected from, and produced by "four-dimensional powers," for his private delectation, and as a means to convince him. "Nothing so false in appearance as naked truth"—is a Kabbalistic saying;—"truth is often stranger than fiction"—is a world-known axiom.

---

*This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for May, 1886.

It requires more than a man of our modern science to realize such a possibility as an interchange of phenomena between the two worlds—the visible and the invisible. A highly spiritual, or a very keen impressionable intellect, is necessary to decipher intuitionally the real from the unreal, the natural from the artificially prepared "screen." Yet our age is a reactionary one, hooked on the very end of the Cyclic coil, or what remains of it. This accounts for the flood of phenomena, as also for the blindness of certain people.

What does materialistic science answer to the idealistic theory of a four-dimensional space? "How!" it exclaims, "and would you make us attempt, while circumscribed within the impossible circle of a three-dimensional space, to even think of a space of higher dimensions! But how is it possible to think of that, which our human thought can never imagine and represent even in its most hazy outlines? One need be quite a different being from a human creature; be gifted with quite a different psychic organization; one must not be a man, in short, to find himself enabled to represent in his thought a four-dimensional space—a thing of length, breadth, thickness and—what else?"

Indeed, "what else?"—for no one of the men of science, who advocate it, perhaps only because they are sincere spiritualists and anxious to explain phenomena by the means of that space, seem to know it themselves. Is it the "passage of matter through matter?" Then why should they insist upon it being a "space" when it is simply another *plane of existence,*—or at least that is what ought to be meant by it,—if it means anything. We occultists say and maintain, that if a name is needed to satisfy the material conceptions of men on our low plane, let them call it by its Hindu name *Mahas* (or Mahaloka)—the fourth world of the higher septenary, and one that corresponds to *Rasatala* (the fourth of the septenary string of the nether worlds)—the fourteen worlds that "sprung from the quintuplicated elements;" for these two worlds are enveloping, so to say, our present fourth-round world. Every Hindu will understand what is meant. *Mahas* is a higher world, or plane of existence rather; as that plane to which belongs the ant just spoken of, is perchance a lower one of the nether septenary chains. And if they call it so—they will be right.

Indeed, people speak of this four-dimensional space as though it were a locality—a sphere instead of being what it is—quite a different state of Being. Ever since it came to be resurrected in people's minds by Prof. Zöllner, it has led to endless confusion. How did it happen? By the means of an abstruse mathematical analysis a spiritual-minded man of science finally came to the laudable conclusion that our conception of space may not be infallible, nor is it absolutely proven that besides our three-dimensional calculations it is mathematically impossible that there are spaces of more or less dimensions in the wide Universe. But, as is well expressed by a sceptic—"the confession of the possible existence of spaces of different dimensions than our own does not afford us (the high mathe-

maticians) the slightest conception of what those dimensions really are. To accept a higher "four-dimensional" space is like accepting infinitude: such an acceptation does not afford us the smallest help by which we might represent to ourselves either of these . . . all we know of such higher spaces is, that they have nothing in common with our conceptions of space." *(Scientific Letters.)*

"Our conception"—means of course the conception of *materialistic* Science, thus leaving a pretty wide margin for other less scienitfic, withal more spiritual, minds.

To show the hopelessness of ever bringing a materialistic mind to realize or even conceive in the most remote and hazy way the presence among us, in our three-dimensional world of other higher planes of being, I may quote from the very interesting objections made by one of the two learned opponents,* already referred to, with regard to this "Space."

He asks: "Is it possible to introduce as an explanation of certain phenomena the action of such a factor, of which we know nothing certain, are ignorant even of its nature and its faculties?"

Perchance, there are such, who may "know" something, who are not so hopelessly ignorant. If an occultist were appealed to, he would say—No; *exact* physical science has to reject its very being, otherwise that science would become *metaphysical.* It cannot be analyzed—hence explained, on either biological or even physiological data. Nevertheless, it might, inductively—as *gravitation* for instance, of which you know no more than that its effects may be observed on our three-dimensional earth."

Again (1) "It is said" (by the advocates of the theory) "that we live *unconditionally* in our three-dimensional space! Perchance" *(unconditionally,)* "just because we are able to comprehend only such space, and absolutely incapable, owing to our organization, to realize it in any other, but a three-dimensional way!"

(2) In other words, "even our three-dimensional space is not something *existing independently,* but represents merely the product of our understanding and perceptions."

To the first statement Occultism answers that those "incapable to realize" any other space but a three-dimensional one, do well to leave alone all others. But it is not "owing to our (human) organization," but only to the intellectual organization of those who are not able to conceive of any other; to organisms undeveloped spiritually and even mentally in the right direction. To the second statement it would reply, that the "opponent" is absolutely wrong in the first, and absolutely right in the last portion of his sentence. For, though the "fourth dimension"—if we must so call it—exists no more *independently* of our perceptions and senses than our three-dimensional *imagined* space, nor as a locality, it still *is,* and exists for the beings evoluted and born in it as "a product of their understanding and *their* perceptions." Nature never draws too harsh lines of demarcation, never builds impassable walls, and her unbridged

*1883.—*Scientific Letters*—published in the *Novoye Vremya, St. Petersburg.*

"chasms" exist merely in the tame conceptions of certain naturalists. The two (and more) "spaces," or planes of being, are sufficiently interblended to allow of a communication between those of their respective inhabitants who are capable of conceiving both a higher and a lower plane. There may be amphibial beings intellectually as there are amphibious creatures terrestrially.

The objector to a fourth dimensional plane complains that the section of high mathematics, known at present under the name of "Metamathematics," or "Metageometry," is being misused and misapplied by the spiritualists. They "seized hold of, and fastened to it as to an anchor of salvation." His arguments are, to say the least, curious. "Instead of proving the reality of their mediumistic phenomena," he says, "they took to explaining them on the hypothesis of a fourth dimension. Do we see the hand of a Katie King, which disappears in "unknown space",—forthwith on the proscenium—the *fourth* dimension; do we get knots on a rope whose two ends are tied and sealed—again that fourth dimension. From this standpoint space is viewed as something objective. It is believed that there are indeed in nature three, four and five dimensional spaces. But firstly, by the means of mathematical analysis, we might arrive, in this way, at an endless series of *spaces*. Only think, what would become of exact science, if, to explain phenomena, such hypothetical *spaces* were called to its help. "If one should fail, we could evoke another, a still higher one, and so on. . . . "

Oh, poor Kant! and yet, we are told that one of his fundamental principles was—that our three-dimensional space is not an absolute one; and that "even in respect to such axioms as those of Euclid's geometry, our knowledge and sciences can only be relatively exact and real."

But why should exact science be thought in danger only because spiritualists try to explain their phenomena on that plane? And on what other could they explain that which is inexplicable if we undertake to analyze it on the three-dimensional conceptions of terrestrial science, if not by a fourth-dimensional conception? No sane man would undertake to explain the *Dæmon* of Socrates by the shape of the great sage's nose, or attribute the inspiration of the *Light of Asia* to Mr. Ed. Arnold's skull cap. What would become of science—verily, were the phenomena left to be explained on the said hypothesis? Nothing worse, we hope, than what became of science, after the Royal Society had accepted its modern theory of *Light*, on the hypothesis of an universal *Ether*. Ether is no less "a product of our understanding" than Space is. And if one could be accepted, then why reject the other? Is it because one can be materialised in our conceptions, or shall we say had to be, since there was no help for it; and that the other, being useless as a hypothesis for the purposes of exact science, is not, so far?

So far as the Occultists are concerned, they are at one with the man of strict orthodox science, when to the offer made "to experiment and to observe whether there may not occur in our three-

dimensional world phenomena, explainable only on the hypothesis of the existence of a space of four dimensions," they answer as they do. "Well"—they say—"and shall observation and experiment give us a satisfactory answer to our question concerning the real existence of a higher four-dimensional space? or, solve for us a dilemma unsolvable from whatever side we approach it? How can our human observation and our human experiments, possible only *unconditionally* within the limits of a space of three dimensions, serve us as a point of departure for the recognition of phenomena which can be explained *"only if we admit the existence of a four-dimensional space?"*

The above objections are quite right we think; and the spiritualists would be the only losers were they to ever prove the existence of such space or its interference in their phenomena. For see, what would happen. No sooner would it be demonstrated that—say, a ring does pass through solid flesh and emigrate from the arm of the medium on to that of the investigator who holds the two hands of the former; or again, that flowers and other material things are brought through closed doors and walls; and that, therefore, owing to certain exceptional conditions, matter can pass through matter,—no sooner would the men of science get collectively convinced of the fact, than the whole theory of spirit agency and intelligent intervention would crumble to dust. The three-dimensional space would not be interfered with, for the passage of one solid through the other does nothing to do away with even metageometrical dimensions, but matter would be probably endowed by the learned bodies with one more faculty, and the hands of the materialists strengthened thereby. Would the world be nearer the solution of psychic mystery? Shall the noblest aspirations of mankind after the knowledge of real spiritual existence on those planes of being that are now confused with the "four-dimensional space" be the nearer to solution, because exact science shall have admitted as a physical law the action of one man walking deliberately through the physical body of another man, or through a stone wall? Occult sciences teach us that at the end of the Fourth Race, matter, which evolutes, progresses and changes, as we do along with the rest of the kingdoms of nature, shall acquire its fourth sense, as it acquires an additional one with every new Race. Therefore, to an Occultist there is nothing surprising in the idea that the physical world should be developing and acquiring new faculties, —a simple modification of matter, new as it now seems to science, as incomprehensible as were at first the powers of steam, sound, electricity. But what does seem surprising is the spiritual stagnation in the world of intellect, and of the highest exoteric knowledge.

However, no one can impede or precipitate the progress of the smallest cycle. But perhaps old Tacitus was right: "Truth is established by investigation and delay; falsehood prospers by precipitancy." We live in an age of steam and mad activity, and truth can hardly expect recognition in this century. The Occultist waits and bides his time.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

FROM THE BOOK OF IMAGES

THIS is the tale of Lokushna, the great Lord, which the Guru told the assemblage, his voice falling evenly on all alike without distinction of rank or of caste.

In a vision of the night there stood before Lokushna a Yaksha who had the power to assume what form he would, if only the king had ever imagined it.

Lokushna, seeing before him the form of Death, grim and unavoidable, cried out:

"What wouldst thou with me, O Death? Knowest thou not I am King?"

Death answered: "Thou or thy kingdom."

"Spare me yet awhile, O Death. I am not ready, and my people have need of me. Be merciful and compassionate, O Death."

"Thou, or thy kingdom."

Lokushna considered awhile. Born of the Kshattrya caste, he had faced death in many forms. The stamina of former deeds gave him succors.

"Thou wilt have us both in time; me and my kingdom. All that is but waits thy will. Act as seemeth best unto thee."

The demon took another form; pride terrible, implacable, mighty.

"I will spare thee yet awhile, if thou wilt prostrate thyself before me. Be servant unto me and I will make thee Lord of all, so that all that lives shall fear thee. Otherwise I will degrade and outcaste thee. Poverty and dishonor are worse than death."

Lokushna trembled within him, seeking resources. The dim memories of former lives as sudra and as chandala gave him faint succors. At last he answered.

"I can do battle with thee better without than within. Lord of all am I already, save only of myself. My people love me. I would not have any fear me. Do thy evil; I fear thee not, now that I see thee naked as thou art."

Then the Yaksha took on the form of humility and spoke reverently.

"Great King, thy courage is equal to my own. Let us worship together. Bow down with me before the King of Kings."

Lokushna reflected upon this request, made with respect. Merchant memories of lives spent as a great Vaishhya gave him succors.

"Peace be with thee, my Brother. I respect all beings of every kind, but I worship and bow down only to the Self in all beings, making commerce and communion of all Souls."

Then the Yaksha put on garments of light, moon-coloured, soft, bewitching, so that Lokushna saw standing before him the veritable Illuminated One. The King fell on his knees before this wondrous being and with joined palms made obeisance. For the King had many times imagined in himself the hour when the Master would

appear to him. Seeing now the Master Lokushna, the great Lord, humbled himself, saying: "Master, what wouldst thou of me, thy servant?"

The voice of the demon answered so that the sound seemed to the King like honey and the tones like incense spreading from golden censers.

"I am well pleased with thee, my servant, for thou hast recognized me in the midst of all disguises. The visions of other forms were but the trials of thy novitiate. Truly hast thou seen; wisely hast thou discerned. One final test there is: prepare thyself, and be forewarned in time. Listen only to me, and I will give thee wisdom."

The Maharaj kissed in gratitude the shining hem of the garment of the Great Being. "Master, thy servant here is ready for thy guidance. I will do thy will."

Then the demon lifted Lokushna and sat with him, giving him counsel.

"Brother and Companion, thou hast passed already the final test—obedience to my will. I am thy Secret Doctrine and henceforth I will abide with thee, unseen of any save thyself. Thou hast but to obey my Voice in thine inner ear, remembering the greatness of the tasks allotted unto thee. Thou shalt be my Voice in the world. I will be thy Voice within thee."

In the morning the King sat in judgment in the courtyard of the palace. On his one side was the Preceptor, chosen from among those who seek nothing and nothing reject, that the King may have counsel in doing even justice. On the other side of the King reposed the sacred scrolls of the Upanishads that the King may seek wisdom without going to the interpreter's house.

The court-yard thronged with men of all castes, some to witness the administration of justice, some accusing, and some accused.

The officers thrust forward a young girl, newly wife of one accused of defiling his caste.

"Lord," spake the minister of justice, "this woman admits knowledge of her husband's guilt and knowledge of where her husband lies safely hidden, yet refuses to speak and give testimony."

Said the King: "What hast thou to say, woman? Confess his hiding place and thou shalt be forgiven."

"Master, I love my husband; evil though his crime has been, I cannot betray him."

"Thy duty is beforehand to thy King. Confess, or thou shalt surely die."

"Lord, have mercy on me. My tongue refuses to speak and betray him who is my lord."

Into the inner ear of the King whispered the Voice of the Vision. "Justice before mercy. She has defied Thee, the King. This cannot be forgiven. Surely she must die."

Lokushna spoke calmly, but sternly, saying to the officers: "Deliver this woman to the executioner. She has defied justice. Therefore, let justice be done."

A deep murmur pulsed like a wave in the still lake of the court-yard, and all men whispered, "Great is thy fidelity to duty, O King."

There was led forward a neighboring raja, taken in battle for failure to yield tribute to the Maharaj. He stood erect, though weighted with chains, and gazed level upon the King.

"What hast thou to say, ingrate and traitor, that compassion should be bestowed upon thee as an alms of my bounty?"

The Prince replied: "Lord, I ask not alms, nor would accept them from the King of Kings. I demand justice. Thy gatherers forced usury of my subjects, taking license, not taxes; therefore I defended my people against extortions."

Whispered the Voice in the ear of Lokushna: "This is contumacy; stubborn pride superadded to rebellion against thy authority. Moreover, this wretch has blasphemed the name of the Most High. Sins against thee and against thy God cannot be countenanced. Compassion is impossible."

Lokushna spoke, gently and sorrowfully. "I would have spared thee, for mercy knows no distinctions. But thou hast pridefully spoken calumny of the officers of the kingdom, and blasphemy of the Most High King of Kings. Were these sins not rebuked rebellions would distract the people and the wrath of God be invoked. Officers, let him be kept in chains in a dungeon without light and with pariahs for companions, till his pride is humbled."

A roar rose in the court-yard like to the breaking of waves upon a rock-hewn shore. All men rose as one man and made obeisance before the King, saying in deep tones, "Lord of all. thou hast this day preserved thy subjects from evil and humbled thyself before the King of Kings. May our God requite Thee, O Defender of the people and of the faith."

There were brought before the King certain priests and professors of religions accused of inciting riots and destructions, the followers of the ones upon those of the others. Lokushna inquired of each in turn his extenuation. Each in turn professed himself guiltless of evil intent, having been earnest only in the propagation of his faith.

The Voice whispered in the ear of the King. The King spoke aloud so that all men might hear.

"Ye be all manifestly earnest and devout men. Ye have confessed your sins unwittingly committed in haste through religious zeal. Such fervor should be controlled, but encouraged, that ye may continue faithful servants of the established order. Your fidelity to your convictions is commendable. Do not the things which peril the safety of all and tend to bring true religion into disrepute. There is room for all good growths. Go; do no more

violence. Ye are freely pardoned for the sake of God, whom ye serve."

Then the multitude, like a receding wave prostrated themselves before the King, and chanted in unison, "O King, thou art this day sovereign of all our hearts. Peace be unto Thee, for we have this day been witness of Thy divine justice and compassion."

When the court-yard had been emptied of the throngs and there remained only the King, the mendicant and the sacred scrolls of the Upanishads, the Maharaj turned to the Preceptor.

"Did I not well, O Bhikkshu, in the several administrations of justice?"

"Hadst thou asked me before the administrations, I would have answered. Search the Upanishads. In them is the wisdom of the ages."

The Voice whispered in the King's ear: "Lo, this beggar speaks with Thee as with an equal, denying the sacred institutions of rank and of caste, as he were Thy brother and companion—thus to Thee, who art King-Initiate."

Lokushna clapped his hands and thereupon the officers came running.

"Drive forth this upstart who presumes upon the favors which I have shown him."

Obediently the officers scourged forth the mendicant, who walked calmly out to the forest whipped with blows and with revilings.

The Maharaj remained alone. He stretched forth his hand and taking the sacred scroll of the Upanishads, began to read of Vivaswat and of Manu, of Ikswaku and the Rajarshees of old.

"This is well, O Great One," whispered the Voice. "Thou art like unto them, O Restorer of the mighty art which was lost."

Lokushna, well pleased, summoned his scribes and began writing a commentary and interpretation upon the Upanishads.

When the bhikkshu had spoken this parable he remained seated upon the beggared earth looking inward with reverted sight. His disciples with great respect remained in unchanged postures, meditating upon the parable. Only Padani, least of the listeners, moved quietly among the assemblage, seeking further enlightenment. He severally made inquiries and severally received their enlightenments.

The ministrants of the several religions spoke with accord. "It is a good tale," said they, "although it has in it elements of which we disapprove. Yet it showeth how even a great Raj can be simple, just and pious in his attitude. Without doubt our God helps those in high places to administer justice."

The professors of the eight schools of philosophy spoke with accord, though differing much in their interpretations of all things. "We think, as a whole, that the tale was worth telling. Not to speak of serious defects in the bhikkshu's manner of speech, nor of certain fantasies of thought far from original, nor of a certain sameness and repetition unpleasing and unnecessary to refined ears,

there yet remains a valuable lesson to be derived, young man. This: had we been the Preceptor, the King would not have needed the Voice to enable him to administer justice."

Padani spoke to a Vaishhya who replied, "It is not for me to criticize a Maharaj, but had I been the King I would have set free and forgiven the woman newly wedded."

Padani accosted a Kshattrya, resting upon his shield. "Had I been the King," said this one, "I would have set free and honoured the Prince."

Padani spoke to an outcaste. "I forgot in the listening," said he, "that I am a pariah. It is not meet for me to speak an opinion." But Padani urged him for enlightenment and the chandala spoke with reluctance.

"Had I been the King I would have scourged the professors of religion and would have consulted the Preceptor about the case of the Prince."

"And what of the wife newly wed?" urged Padani.

"That I cannot answer, for I have never had a wife. But I think I would have forgiven her and pardoned her husband; or, in default, I would have consulted the Upanishad."

After a time, as the bhikkshu and his chelas wandered toward the forest, Padani consulted the disciples severally, seeking enlightenment, and severally received their replies. All answered alike: "None can tell a tale like our Master. He is our Voice. Would that he had been the Preceptor of the Maharaj. Justice would have been done."

At nightfall Padani remained to serve the Guru while the others went with their begging bowls to the villages round about the margin of the jungle.

The Guru looked at Padani.

"Master," said Padani, "I think that the Maharaj is an image of all men. The vision of the night is the three qualities taking what form they may. The Voice, is it not the voice of the Lower Self, taking the forms which arise from the desires of the imagination?"

The Guru looked favorably upon Padani, who continued:

"And I think that the mind of man is the Kingdom of the Maharaj, with its distinctions of rank and of caste and its imaginations of religion and philosophy, deluding the Lord of the body and the mind.

The Guru still regarding Padani, the disciple spoke further:

"And I think, Master, that though this is a parable, it is also a tale of a veritable Maharaj, and I think, O Father, that thou wert the mendicant who was Preceptor in the court-yard of Lokushna."

The Predecessor made no reply to Padani, who, nevertheless was content, and being content, became absorbed in the mind of the Guru, thus gaining the subtle sight of the subtle-sighted.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

At the meetings of the United Lodge of Theosophists a part of the time is devoted to Question and Answer. The questions and answers that follow were taken stenographically while "The Ocean of Theosophy," by Wm. Q. Judge, was being studied.

It should be remembered that while the answers are given from the standpoint of many years' experience and application, they are not to be taken as hard and fast definitions, nor as authoritative; but may be used as explanations and applications of the philosophy of Theosophy as related to the particular phases presented in the various questions. Each student, being "the final authority" for himself, should not accept any statement by any being whatever unless he himself perceives its truth.

Beginning with Chapter I of the "Ocean," the succeeding chapters will be taken up seriatim.

CHAPTER XI.
(Continued.)

Q. How can the actions of men produce convulsions of nature (p. 96)?

A. Through their cumulative effect upon the psychic nature of the elemental beings. Karma is the key-note of all conditions, for it governs the smallest atom as well as the highest spiritual being. The elementals of the mineral kingdom, and of the kingdoms below that (the elementals proper) are *"psychic embryos."* Every thought of man upon being evolved passes into the inner world, and becomes an *active entity* by coalescing with an elemental—that is to say, with one of the semi-conscious forces of the kingdoms. It survives as an active intelligence—a creature of the mind's begetting. Thus a good thought is perpetuated as an active, beneficent power; an evil one as a maleficent demon. The automatically acting brain stores up only brute energies, and begets correlations that are unfruitful of benefit, and at last bring about convulsions in nature. It is analogous to combinations of chemicals produced by scientific minds—antagonistic elements held in leash, which at last a spark suffices to release and bring about terrific explosions.

Q. And similarly, man's actions or Karma can bring about beneficial effects in the lower kingdoms of nature?

A. It is man who is the real motive and directing power in this universe, for he is at the head, being self-conscious, with the power of acquiring qualities, of understanding the natures of all beings, and of manipulating the lower natures. It devolves on him so to use those natures as to bring about the best results for all the beings concerned in the stream of evolution which makes up this earth and solar system. Man has produced many combinations and transformations in the lower kingdoms, not possible to them of their unaided powers, which are beneficent.

Q. Then man is a Creator in a far wider sense than we are accustomed to think?

A. Undoubtedly. The impulse to action in the lower kingdoms originally proceeds from him. The conscious action of the lower

kingdoms all proceeds from man. After the action there is always the reaction. The elements, the "air, water, fire and earth," or any portion or combination of these, all have their reactions upon us. We experience those reactions from the elements because of our attitude towards them and use of them, for we are the ones who induce them to act whether in a beneficent or a maleficent way. Tornadoes, earthquakes, sufferings of any kind such as wars or strife, either in the elements or amongst men, are all produced by man.

Q. You spoke of the "automatically acting brain;" is there another kind of action possible with our brains?

A. Certainly. In the one case there is but brute force stored up and flung out without any transmutation of that brute energy into higher forms of dynamics. In the other, the intellection of the truly scientifically occupied brain, there is the evolution of a sublimated form of spiritual energy which, cosmically speaking, is productive of illimitable results for good. The human brain may be used as an exhaustless generator of higher forms of energy from lower. The adept does not create anything new; he only transforms the materials in nature. The one wastes and debases the creative power; the other conserves and elevates the natures of all.

Q. There would seem to be no limit to any one's responsibility?

A. There isn't. Whenever and whatever any one thinks or does, he cannot do so without affecting other beings, whether human beings or beings below or above, as every action is felt throughout the whole of the universe in some degree. He gets the reaction in his own moral nature from the lines of his mental action; and at the same time he will be physically acting along the same lines, affecting others for good or evil both on the inner and the outer planes of action; then he gets the physical reaction.

Q. Then there is never any injustice?

A. There is no injustice. What we see as apparent injustice seems so because we do not see the causes which have produced the present ill effects. If we have no knowledge of our own real nature and the Law of Karma that is inherent in it, then the feeling can only be that we have received injustice, and we harbor hatred and resentments. What prevents our understanding these things is mainly that we do not know what we are here for. We look at things from a one-life basis, and finding ourselves in this life we imagine it is something we had nothing to do with. Seeing others, according to our view, more fortunate than ourselves, we want to know why, and no answer being possible on the basis we have assumed, we assume that we are receiving injustice. If Karma is the doctrine of responsibility, Reincarnation is the doctrine of hope. The two go together. The reason we are on earth, according to the Occult teaching: we are not here because of our virtues; we are here because of our defects. The "personality" is really the working off of defects. If we do not learn what the object of life is, and don't do the work, then we are only creating more defects to adjust, and more trouble for ourselves.

Q. Who is to be the judge of a man's motives in what he feels and what he does?

A. The man himself. But he must forget himself if he is to judge truly. No judge can be impartial if he has any self-interest in his own decisions. So if we have any self-interest in our decisions we cannot judge our motives; we can only judge them aright when we seek nothing for ourselves. The best guide and the greatest protection any man can have is a firm desire to benefit humanity and seek nothing for himself.

Q. By punishing those who have earned punishment, do we not aid Karma, and become an agent of justice?

A. No. The Bible has many occult sayings. You know the one which says, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord (Law). The Law takes care of its own. We do not have to make ourselves instruments of vengeance. We have in our modern civilization our means of taking vengeance; but as a matter of fact our means are errant, imperfect, and injurious. The taking of the life of a fellow being for having killed another, is no more justified when done by a number of men than was the first murder. That is wrong, but to sequester the murderer so that he cannot continue to injure others, is quite another story.

Q. Do we injure others with our hatred?

A. No man can feel hatred and not injure others.

Q. But if our own thoughts are such that there is no hatred in us, we would not be affected by the hatred of another?

A. That is the whole story. If a man thinks and feels toward his fellow-men without either hatred or revenge in him, nothing of that kind can touch him.

Q. If one affected by the action of another has no desire to injure that other, does that mitigate the action for that other?

A. Of course it does. But there are two propositions there. The one who has been injured is reaping what he has sown, or he could not have been injured. But he may by his change of nature and attitude and his desire to cease injuring others, refuse to do any evil in return. But the one who inflicts or still holds the injury gets all the reactions that flow from that attitude. He has not changed; he is still the same nature; still has the same desire. Oftentimes when one does injury to another and gets no return in kind, he is more incensed than ever. You cannot make another feel differently unless he wants to. So, while we may be thinking kindly of another, we cannot change his feelings. He alone can do that. So we might help him and we might not; but at all events we get the benefit of the effect of our own beneficent attitude. If we do not affect the other favorably, it is because he is so infected (not affected) that we cannot help him. It all depends on the nature of the recipient; on the "nature of the beast." Take a rattlesnake. No man, however kind his feelings, could change that snake's nature.

Q. But if it is our Karma to have bad and revengeful feelings and thoughts, then we cannot help acting that way?

A. Yes we can. Karma is present action as well as the present effect of former acting. While we may not always be able to affect the attitude of another, we can, as just said, always affect our own attitude. If we could not we would be mere machines, mere creatures of our past, not Creators in the present. We ought to know that, for anybody knows better than to inflict injury. He recognizes what is harmful to another, but if he is so selfish that he does not care, he becomes a destructive force, not a creative one; and must take the reaction. "Evil must be in the world, but woe to him by whom evil comes." Woe to those who *make themselves* the agent through whom evil Karma acts, because it is their own nature that is played upon in that case.

Q. What does it mean to be Karma-less?

A. All that is Karma-less is that in us which lives and thinks, the Perceiver, the Real Man. He is the institutor and the experiencer of all Karma. There is no Karma unless he makes it. He is not changed by Karma, neither made greater nor less; but while *attached to action* (Karma) or in a body and circumstances created by him, he experiences *all* that flows from the actions to which he is attached, until he ceases from the attachment to that kind of action. He gets whatever experiences his actions in that body bring him.

Q. The OCEAN *says that certain entities through wickedness are annihilated. Does that refer to the* EGO*?*

A. How could it, if the Ego, the real Man, is not affected permanently by action? Let us look at it in this way: An Ego, or spiritual being, has been so wholly wicked in his actions for many incarnations that there is not a kind thought or feeling of any kind; nothing but brutal and selfish thoughts, producing only pain and suffering in the world. His *works* are destroyed: the personality built up by that kind of thought and feeling. Nothing of that personality can be attached to or assimilated by the spiritual being. His attitude having been wholly against the rest, the motion of the whole must at last crush that kind of works (Karma) *out of existence*. That does not destroy the Ego, but it destroys his works, his accumulation of experiences. It throws him out of his place, and he has to start again from where he was before his evil courses began, for that is where he belongs. The Ego *cannot* be annihilated; but his incarnations may be of such a nature as to be lost and he be thrown out of a certain stream and have to go back to the place where he left the line and begin again. But the real Man remains and his *real* works; that is, the acquired wisdom and the acquired experience. He may lose a lot of leaves out of the Book of Life, but He remains.

Q. But there must be Karma to bring that Ego back again?

A. He gets the Karma of having to go back to the mental deposits stored up in long previous incarnations, whether on this globe

or some other, and starting afresh on a line based on those mental deposits. He has lost a vast amount of time and effort, and experienced a vast amount of fruitless suffering—fruitless of good, that is, its only effect being destructive of all his works. And he has to overcome the tendencies he has engendered, when he comes into incarnation again—the tendencies to repeat.

Q. This seems somewhat confusing.

A. There should be no confusion if you keep in mind the idea of the Individuality—the permanent spiritual being, the reincarnating Ego, which is the Triad of Atma-Buddhi-Manas. Lower Manas —the personality—is *the outlook upon physical existence* which Higher Manas has, as the result of his thought and action on the physical plane of life. He may change that outlook, or he may lose it, and begin a new series of efforts; or in some cases he may be thrown out for that incarnation or for a great period and have to incarnate in a new period, under conditions of ignorance instead of knowledge. That, too, is his Karma; the evil results engendered by his own former actions. The only basis he would have would be the tendencies he had engendered; and these he would have to conquer.

Q. Cannot this fate be avoided?

A. Only by a change of basis; the adoption of a better course of action. Any attempt to "avoid" the results of our own actions only results in a stronger reaction; because, by attempting to avoid, we merely store up or hold back that force which would naturally have exhausted itself in its own period.

SECRET DOCTRINE TEACHINGS*

* * * Karma creates nothing, nor does it design. It is man who plans and creates causes, and Karmic law adjusts the effects: which adjustment is not an act, but universal harmony, tending ever to resume its original position, like a bough, which, bent down too forcibly, rebounds with corresponding vigour. If it happens to dislocate the arm that tried to bend it out of its natural position, shall we say that it is the bough which broke our arm, or that our own folly has brought us to grief? Karma has never sought to destroy intellectual and individual liberty, like the God invented by the Monotheists. It has not involved its decrees in darkness purposely to perplex man; nor shall it punish him who dares to scrutinize its mysteries. On the contrary, he who unveils through study and meditation its intricate paths, and throws light on those dark ways, in the windings of which so many men perish owing to their ignorance of the labyrinth of life, is working for the good of his fellowmen.

*From the Original Edition, Vol. II, p. 305; see Third Edition, Vol. II, p. 319.

SELF, POTENCIES, VESTURES*

The Crest Jewel of Wisdom. Shankara's Vivekachudamani: 71-150

THE THREE POTENCIES.

(Concluded)

THE power of the supreme Master, that is called unmanifested, beginningless unwisdom whose very self is the three potencies, to be known through thought, by its workings,—this is glamor, whereby all this moving world is made to grow.

Neither being nor non-being nor of the self of both of these; neither divided nor undivided nor of the self of both of these; neither formed nor formless nor of the self of both of these,—very wonderful and ineffable is its form.

To be destroyed by the awakening to the pure, secondless Eternal, as the serpent imagined in a rope, when the rope is seen; its potencies are called substance, force, and darkness; each of them known by their workings. The self of doing belongs to force, whose power is extension, whence the preëxistent activities issued; rage and all the change of the mind that cause sorrow are ever its results.

Desire, wrath, greed, vanity, malice, self-assertion, jealousy, envy, are the terrible works of Force, its activities in man; therefore this is the cause of bondage.

Then enveloping is the power of Darkness, whereby a thing appears as something else; this is the cause of the circling birth and rebirth of the spirit, and the cause whereby extension is drawn forward.

Though a man be full of knowledge, learned, skillful, very subtle-sighted, if Darkness has wrapped him round, he sees not, though he be full of manifold instruction; he calls good that which is raised by error, and leans upon its properties, unlucky man that he is; great and hard to end is the enveloping power of Darkness.

Wrong thinking, contradictory thinking, fanciful thinking, confused thinking,—these are its workings; this power of extension never leaves hold of one who has come into contact with it, but perpetually sends him this way and that.

Unwisdom, sluggishness, inertness, sloth, infatuation, folly, and things like these are of the potency of Darkness. Under the yoke of these he knows nothing at all, but remains as though asleep or like a post.

But the potency of substance is pure like water, and even though mixed with the other two, it builds for the true refuge; for it is a reflected spark of the Self, and lights up the inert like the sun.

---

*This article was printed by Wm. Q. Judge in the *Oriental Department* papers, November-December, 1895.

Of the potency of Substance when mixed the properties are self-respect, self-restraint, control, faith and love and the longing to be free, a godlike power and a turning back from the unreal.

Of the potency of substance altogether pure the properties are grace, direct perception of the Self, and perfect peace; exulting gladness, a resting on the Self supreme, whereby he reaches the essence of real bliss.

The unmanifest is characterized by these three potencies; it is the causal vesture of the Self; dreamless life is the mode where it lives freely, all the activities of the powers, and even of the knowing soul having sunk back into it.

Every form of outward perceiving has come to rest, the knowing soul becomes latent in the Self from which it springs; the name of this is dreamless life, wherein he says "I know nothing at all of the noise of the moving world."

The body, powers, life-breaths, mind, self-assertion, all changes, sensuous things, happiness, unhappiness, the ether and all the elements, the whole world up to the unmanifest,—this is not Self.

Glamor and every work of glamor from the world-soul to the body, know this as unreal, as not the Self, built up of the mirage of the desert.

But I shall declare to you the own being of the Self supreme, knowing which a man, freed from his bonds, reaches the lonely purity.

There is a certain selfhood wherein the sense of "I" forever rests; who witnesses the three modes of being, who is other than the five veils; who is the only knower in waking, dreaming, dreamlessness; of all the activities of the knowing soul, whether good or bad,—this is the "I;"

Who of himself beholds all; whom none beholds; who kindles to consciousness the knowing soul and all the powers; whom none kindles to consciousness; by whom all this is filled; whom no other fills; who is the shining light within this all; after whose shining all else shines;

By whose nearness only body and powers and mind and soul do their work each in his own field, as though sent by the Self;

Because the own nature of this is eternal wakefulness, self-assertion the body and all the powers, and happiness and unhappiness are beheld by it, just as an earthen pot is beheld. This inner Self, the ancient Spirit, is everlasting, partless, immediately experienced happiness; ever of one nature, pure waking knowledge, sent forth by whom Voice and the life-breaths move.

Here, verily, in the substantial Self, in the hidden place of the soul, this steady shining begins to shine like the dawn; then the shining shines forth as the noonday sun, making all this world to shine by its inherent light; knower of all the changing moods of mind and inward powers; of all the acts done by body, powers, life-breaths; present in them as fire in iron, strives not nor changes at all;

This is not born nor dies nor grows, nor does it fade or change forever; even when this form has melted away, it no more melts than the air in a jar.

Alike stranger to forming and deforming; of its own being, pure wakefulness; both being and non-being is this, besides it there is nothing else; this shines unchanging, this Supreme Self gleams in waking, dream and dreamlessness as "I," present as the witness of the knowing soul.

BONDAGE AND FREEDOM.

Then, holding firmly mind, with knowing soul at rest, know your self within yourself face to face saying, "This am I." The life-ocean, whose waves are birth and dying, is shoreless; cross over it, fulfilling the end of being, resting firm in the Eternal.

Thinking things not self are "I,"—this is bondage for a man; this, arising from unwisdom, is the cause of falling into the weariness of birth and dying; this is the cause that he feeds and anoints and guards this form, thinking it the Self; the unreal, real; wrapping himself in sensuous things as a silk-worm in his own threads.

The thought that what is not That is That grows up in the fool through darkness; because no discernment is there, it wells up, as the thought that a rope is a snake; thereupon a mighty multitude of fatuities fall on him who accepts this error, for he who grasps the unreal is bound; mark this, my companion.

By the power of wakefulness, partless, external, secondless, the Self wells up with its endless lordship; but this enveloping power wraps it round, born of Darkness, as the dragon of eclipse envelopes the rayed sun.

When the real Self with its stainless light recedes, a man thinking "this body is I," calls it the Self; then by lust and hate and all the potencies of bondage, the great power of Force that they call extension greatly afflicts him.

Torn by the gnawing of the toothed beast of great delusion; wandered from the Self, accepting every changing mood of mind as himself, through this potency, in the shoreless ocean of birth and death, full of the poison of sensuous things, sinking and rising, he wanders, mean-minded, despicable-minded.

As a line of clouds, born of the sun's strong shining, expands before the sun and hides it from sight, so self-assertion, that has come into being through the Self, expands before the Self and hides it from sight. As when on an evil day the lord of day is swallowed up in thick, dark clouds, an ice-cold hurricane of wind, very terrible, afflicts the clouds in turns; so when the Self is enveloped in impenetrable Darkness, the keen power of extension drives with many afflictions the man whose soul is deluded.

From those two powers a man's bondage comes; deluded by them he errs, thinking the body is the Self

Of the plant of birth and death, the seed is Darkness, the sprout is the thought that body is Self, the shoot is rage, the sap is deeds,

the body is the stem, the life-breaths are the branches, the tops are the bodily powers, sensuous things are the flowers, sorrow is the fruit, born of varied deeds and manifold; and the Life is the bird that eats the fruit.

This bondage to what is not Self, rooted in unwisdom, innate, made manifest without beginning or end, gives life to the falling torrent of sorrow, of birth and death, of sickness and old age.

Not by weapons nor arms, not by storm nor fire nor by a myriad deeds can this be cut off, without the sword of discernment and knowledge, very sharp and bright, through the grace of the guiding power.

He who is single-minded, fixed on the word divine, his steadfast fulfilment of duty will make the knowing soul within him pure; to him whose knowing soul is pure, a knowing of the Self supreme shall come; and through this knowledge of the Self supreme he shall destroy this circle of birth and death and its root together.

FROM ISIS UNVEILED*

As our planet revolves once every year around the sun and at the same time turns once in every twenty-four hours upon its own axis, thus traversing minor circles within a larger one, so is the work of the smaller cyclic periods accomplished and recommenced, within the Great Saros.

The revolution of the physical world, according to the ancient doctrine, is attended by a like revolution in the world of intellect—the spiritual evolution of the world proceeding in cycles, like the physical one.

* * * * * * *

Thus, all those great characters who tower like giants in the history of mankind, like Buddha-Siddârtha, and Jesus, in the realm of spiritual, and Alexander the Macedonian and Napoleon the Great, in the realm of physical conquests, were but reflexed images of human types which had existed ten thousand years before, in the preceding decimillennium, reproduced by the mysterious powers controlling the destinies of our world. There is no prominent character in all the annals of sacred or profane history whose prototype we cannot find in the half-fictitious and half-real traditions of bygone religions and mythologies. As the star, glimmering at an immeasurable distance above our heads, in the boundless immensity of the sky, reflects itself in the smooth waters of a lake, so does the imagery of men of the antediluvian ages reflect itself in the periods we can embrace in an historical retrospect.

"As above, so it is below. That which has been, will return again. As in heaven, so on earth."

---

* Original Edition, Vol. I, pp. 34-35.

ON THE LOOKOUT

The Keystone Magazine of Optometry, published at Philadelphia, contains in its June number a thoughtful study on "Color Vision," being a lecture delivered before the Scientific Section of the 21st Annual Congress of the American Optometric Association, by W. B. Needles, M. D. Students of the Occult sciences will find much of interest in Dr. Needles' remarks. In speaking of "after images" the Doctor says, "It is well known that if one fixes his gaze intently upon a bright red object, then directs his eyes toward a white screen, he will see projected upon the latter a perfect reproduction of the red object, but its color will now be green. Or if the eyes be fixed upon a green object for sixty seconds, then the gaze shifted to the white screen, a red image of the green object will be projected on the screen. . . . Stand at a window in bright light, look fixedly at a red object for a time and then withdraw to a darker part of the room but continue to gaze at the red object and it will turn to a brilliant blue-green." He further says that over-exposure of the eyes to the stronger colors of the spectrum is "highly injurious to the general health." Some colors are restful, others irritating, without regard to the character of the objects viewed. He finds that certain colors have much the same effect on the nervous system as certain sounds. He instances the extreme opposites of red and violet, the one producing such serious effects that the health of an entire family has been upset by daily contact with red on the walls of living rooms. Violet has long been known to cause extreme mental depression. He thinks red corresponds to low-pitched harsh tones, and violet to high-pitched "screeches and scratching noises which set the teeth on edge." He further states that the ultra-violet and infra-red, not ordinarily visible, produce similar injurious effects on which "volumes could be written."

We have not reproduced the current scientific speculations as to the reasons for the phenomena adduced, because they are purely speculative and materialistic. Rather, our purpose is to bring before theosophical students familiar with the "occult teachings" of H. P. B., some phenomenal, attested, scientific facts, which they may consider in the light of some of H. P. B.'s statements. The human eye she called "the most occult organ on the superficies of the body," perhaps just for the reason that it is of all portions of the body the one most sensitive to "light." And students should know that the anatomy of the brain structure reveals a close affinity between the *centers* of sight and hearing. Much that H. P. B. wrote on "sound" and "color" can only be properly considered objectively by remembering that to her both these are "vibrations," *i. e., super*-physical matter; and subjectively, that sight and sound are corresponding disturbances in the inner "sheaths of the soul" composed of specializations of those same substances. As each "sheath" corresponds to a "principle," a plane of being, a state of consciousness and its corresponding states of action and sensation, the intuitive student may be able to "see" something in the phenomena of "complementary colors" spoken of by Dr. Needles, that will bring home a wider range of thought in regard to some of the profundities in the said "occult teachings." In general, students of the Occult are more familiar with theory than with parctice. It would be well if more of them availed themselves of the facts adduced by scientific investigators: they would in that way come nearer a basis for *practical* Occultism. But enough.

H. P. B. more than once referred to the dangers of the "materialization of the Spiritual" as the one great danger threatening the humanity of our times. Amongst these dangers she instanced modern Spiritualism which she

called the "worship of the dead;" Christian Science, and countless vagaries under the names of "new thought," "psychic research," pseudo-occultism, "left hand magic," and so on; all being varieties of the attempt to explore and exploit the "psychical powers latent in man" for personal, selfish benefit, no matter how gilded with lofty phrases. Her article, "Lodges of Magic" was written to inform and warn theosophical students that these dangers have to be faced by every one in whom there is the dawning of that "faculty of perception" variously called "psychological powers," "suggestion," clairvoyance, and so on. Nearly half a century of history has enforced her warnings, but few as yet heed them. We are on the straight road to a renascence of something worse than the witchcraft, demonology, superstition and oppressions in church and state that made the middle ages the night of Europe —for the Egos of to-day are of a higher order than those then incarnated, and the abuse of psychical powers will in consequence bear far worse fruits. We wonder if many readers of THEOSOPHY have received a circular letter and folder from the *Literary Digest* urging their purchase of the "basic reading course" of *The Society of Applied Psychology?*

The Literary Digest, we think most persons would agree, is the foremost publication of its kind in America. Its readers—and they number perhaps a million or more—are educated, professional, literary, scientific, educational and clerical men and women. It would not, perhaps, be too much to say that its readers are the most influential and representative of American citizens, and that the recommendations of the *Digest* have great weight with them. In this circular letter the statement is made:

> "The editors and the business executives of The Literary Digest feel that they are qualified to know the importance of Psychology. Their very profession demands that they bring an accurate knowledge of this subject to their daily tasks. The nature of their work, moreover, has brought them into intimate touch with all the existing works on Applied Psychology. . . . They are prepared to agree with the thousands of other leading business and professional men who say that the teachings of this Society are the most practicable, the most concrete, the most usable, and profitable that have ever come under their observation.
>
> The Literary Digest is so profoundly impressed with the remarkable results which this Society has obtained, and can obtain, in giving men a working knowledge of human behavior, that it regards it as a privilege to co-operate in making it easy for thoughtful people to become Associate Members and enjoy the resulting benefits."

We are bound to assume that the circular letter and its accompanying folder are "practicable, concrete, usable, and profitable" examples and exemplifications of that "applied Psychology" itself. Here are some of the statements made of the "practical training" the members will receive:

> "How to Attain Control of the Mind; How to Influence Others through Mental Imagery;"

and in the printed folder we are assured,

> "It will give you such specific directions for the use of these new-found powers, that whatever your environment, whatever your business, whatever your ambition,
>
> *You need but to follow these plain and simple instructions in order to do the thing you want to do, be the man you want to be, or get the thing you want to have."*

And the following are some of the suggestions given as to the contents of the "twelve volumes" by means of which the purchaser is to "Win Happiness and Wealth:"

Rules for Influencing Others; Words that Create Desire; The Ruling Passion; What Selling Effectiveness Depends On; Principles of Persuasion; Bending Others to Your Will; The Ability to Read Men; Acquiring Great Power Over Others; Talk that Wins Men Over.

Special paragraphs are devoted to such subjects as these in the folder:

The Lawyer's Infallible Aid in Reading, Dominating, Convincing Men; Advertising that Pays Results from Applied Psychology; What Makes the Winning Appeal for the Minister or Public Speaker; The Great Secret of Making Sales; Finding the Popular Appeal that Wins Votes; Society Rewards the Master of Psychology.

What is one to think of the moral obliquity and spiritual depravity of a generation whose leading publications and whose leading class have such a basis and are interested in such objectives as are held out by the *Literary Digest,* the Society for Applied Psychology "operating under the sponsorship and direction of distinguished scientists and well-known men of affairs" —to quote again from the Digest's circular letter? Not to speak of the "thousands of leading business and professional men." The Society is chartered "for educational and scientific purposes," according to the letterhead. So far as we can perceive from a careful reading of the circular and folder there is no thought of any moral responsibility, no idea of the spiritual resultants of such a course of procedure as is recommended. "It has given clergymen, lawyers, physicians, educators, representatives of nearly every profession, *a usable and profitable knowledge of human nature directly applicable to their everyday pursuits heretofore unobtainable* except through long and arduous special college courses." *Finis corona opus*—the end justifies the means. Surely it would "pay" to be able to "bend others to your will," to "acquire great power over others," to "dominate men." Can the "Hun," the Bolsheviki, the I. W. W. agitator and the anarchist have any better or more inspiring guide than is here offered by the *Literary Digest* and its "applied psychology"? Suppose these "sponsors" and their students could succeed in getting at some of the "secrets of Occultism," what, think you, would they do with them? We may thank from the bottom of our hearts the Masters of Wisdom and their disciples of every degree that They shelter mankind as far as possible from the horrors of Black Magic—occult powers sought and used for selfish purposes. Not even the dreadful pall of the Great War and its consequences yet to come are as fraught with evil possibilities as are wrapped up and implicit in the "applied psychology" to which we have called attention. Such is our opinion. It is a time and a season for theosophists and all others who love their fellow men to strive without ceasing to point men to true morality, to a more spiritual use of the powers they now have; not to any increase of powers on the part of those whose only thought seems to be self interest and self-aggrandizement. And such are the 'leaders of mankind" to-day.

The Enneads of Plotinus, the Neo-Platonist, have been translated and published by an American clergyman, and simultaneously by an Englishman. Thomas Whittaker's "The Neo-Platonists" is now in its second edition. And Dean Inge of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, has just published two volumes of Lectures on "The Philosophy of Plotinus." Dean Inge pays remarkable tribute in these words:

"We cannot preserve Platonism without Christianity, *nor Christianity without Platonism,* nor civilization without *both.*"

The italics are our own, but the words are those of the most noted clergyman of the Church of England. He goes on to say,

"Neo-Platonism differs from Christianity in that it offers us a religion the truth of which is not contingent on any particular events, whether past or present."

This is at once to vacate the whole position of orthodox, theological, historical Christianity; no miracles, no special revelation, no unique savior, no "word of God." The appeal of Christianity and its pretensions rest precisely on these things; Platonism or neo-platonism on the inner experience of the individual man, on pre-existence, reincarnation, Karma. The two beliefs are incompatible. Christianity is doomed the moment it takes only a position of claimed equality. Its life depends on its claimed exclusiveness. But Dean Inge cannot be either logically or morally consistent in retaining his status as a "Christian" and placing the Alexandrine school on a parity with the Episcopate. What is he—and what are other thousands like him—going to do? They cannot long "halt betwixt two opinions." They cannot go backwards—they must go forward to the rejection of supernatural, *i. e.*, revealed religion, altogether. This is one of the by-products and corollary resultants of the work and writings of H. P. Blavatsky, as all theosophical students know. Its importance cannot be measured at this time, but it must inevitably lead the foremost clergy of the West either to a complete rejection of the present Christian religion, or a return to the simple ethics of Jesus plus the "lost chord" of Karma and reincarnation. We are not merely witnessing in these days the death of the "Divine right of Kings," but the death of the "Divine right of Christianity." We are on the verge of a reign of utter materialistic immorality or of the worst kind of superstition and black magic if men like Dean Inge do not with a courage equal to their convictions cast off the last shackles of a dead theology and preach a new faith and a true one.

Arthur Clutton-Brock is an English man of letters and art critic on the London *Times*. In the July *Atlantic Monthly* he writes on "Religion Now." The article is remarkable for two things: a conscientious facing of the state of the religious feeling in England at the present time; a totally inaccurate survey of Theosophical teachings. For the former he is to be esteemed; for the latter he, we think, is not to be blamed, but rather the impure sources from which he has derived his conceptions of Theosophy. But let us quote, then comment.

> In England, now, there is a great desire for belief, satisfied by no existing church or sect. . . . Our desire is to believe, not to disbelieve; but what?
>
> Many varieties of Christianity offer us belief; but not one of them satisfies us. They all have their convinced believers, but they do not win the ablest, or the most naturally religious, among us. . . . We believe, far more than our fathers did, that the truth is hidden in it; but it remains, for us, hidden. . . .
>
> Science has not made us wise about the nature of the universe or our own nature. We know in our hearts that not only the Germans, but all of us, have been fools: we have believed something sillier than the silliest version of Christianity, namely, that mankind was advancing toward perfection by some mechanical process called evolution. . . .
>
> But now this struggle for life. . . . has turned into a struggle for death. When we fought against the Germans we rebelled against the whole doctrine of the struggle for life; we affirmed the will of man, the will for righteousness; and, now that we have won, we are less than ever content to believe that we have survived because we are the fittest. For those whom we loved best have died for us; and we do not believe they died because they were less fit than ourselves.

Mr. Clutton-Brock then takes up the Catholic, the Episcopal Church of England, and the various protestant sects, but finds in none of them the bread of life. "If," he says, "Christianity is to prevail now, it must do so,

not by expressing a number of good intentions so vaguely that anyone can agree to them. It must convince us that the universe is of a certain nature, and that we have to live according to that nature."

> I do not know how it is with you in America, but in England all churches and sects fail to convince because not one of them can achieve a harmony between the rich and the poor, the ignorant and the educated, a harmony both of belief and action. . . . Early Christianity prevailed because it brought an immense hope into the world; Christianity can prevail now only if it renews that hope in the terms of our own time and in relation to our problems. At present no church and no sect does that.

He considers the Salvation Army; "It is possible only for the poor." He goes on to say of it what, we think, is equally true of all the Christian denominations:

> It is evangelical in the old sense, offering men individual salvation. It can, and does, cure them of drink, but there is no philosophy in it, no political hope. It talks of the blood of Jesus, but not of the nature of the universe. Its one aim is immediate rescue—a noble aim, no doubt, but altogether hand-to-mouth. It is concerned with what it shall do to comfort an overworked charwoman; it has no faith by which it can change the world so that charwoman shall not be overworked.

No thoughtful Christian, as no thoughtful man of any persuasion, can do other than feel much as does Mr. Clutton-Brock as to the religious state of the world and the something lacking in all our faiths. But ought not he, and the rest of us, to get rid of some of our conceit, largely the basis both of our fault-finding, of our defective faiths, and of our inability to perceive the real difficulty? He says frankly we have all been in error for some twenty centuries, yet assumes unconsciously that because our heads and hearts have been bruised by the events of the last five years, wisdom must, perforce, have entered us. If we have been so ignorant and errant in the past, would not a little humility in respect of our own sovereign ability to see truly be in order now? Might not a genuine humility be the very first step in true perception of the underlying causation of all this harvest of woes? Thus, Mr. Clutton-Brock, spite of the admitted failure of the sects and churches, still looks longingly to them, demanding from them another "immense hope" to replace the one which he and others like him have weighed in the balance and found wanting. This is purely Nicomedian. Christianity indeed 'brought an immense hope into the world"—a "faith," something to believe. It has failed because it did *not* bring a corresponding *responsibility* to the mind of *man*. "Faith without works is dead." This is the epitaph of Christianity. It did indeed supply the heart with hope, but it did not supply the head with responsibility. Who will work, if faith will produce the harvest? Clutton-Brock does not see now, any more than men have in other days, that knowledge is as necessary as faith. He does not see that the churches are but an expression of the ignorant hopes and desires of mankind: the churches do not re-mould the minds of men; the minds of men re-mould the churches. Mankind is as pagan, as selfish, as ignorant, as conceited as ever: the churches represent human ideals, longings, aspirations; not the divine fruitage. They bear green leaves and flowers in abundance, watered by faith. But the pollen of Theo-Sophia, Divine Knowledge, is lacking, and so men starve in the midst of their Paradise of faith. Men's faiths are one thing, their works another—hence all men and all churches are a house divided against itself.

> As for the Theosophists: their doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and of Karma, has this defect, that it is devised to explain things, and to justify the ways of God to man. Things are what they are—the

very iniquities of the world are what they are—because we are paying, o being paid, for the past. . . . But nothing could be more contrary t the most profound and surprising part of Christ's teaching than this doc trine of Karma. . . .

The effort of the Theosophists to find justice in the universe, as we see it, is based upon the conception of a static universe, with its future al involved in its past. In that conception there is no hope for the wicked the weakling, the degenerate. As they have been, so they will be; the best that they can do is to consent to their evil fate because it is the resul of their own past. . . .

Theosophy, like the old scientific determinism, is retrograde. . . It is a kind of Calvanism orientalized. . . .

Clutton-Brock has most assuredly derived his ideas as to what constitutes Theosophy in the same place that the mass of men, Christian or otherwise have derived their ideas of other great Teachings: *By going to the interpreter's house,* and not to the Source of those Teachings. His expositions o Karma and Reincarnation are those of Nemesis, of Fatalism, of Hindu sects of theosophical interpreters. They are anything but the Teachings of Theosophy as put on record in clear words by H. P. Blavatsky, by Plotinus, by Plato, by Buddha, by Krishna, and by Jesus of Nazareth and many others What is the meaning of the parable and its question, Do men gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles? What means Saint Paul, Be not deceived God is not mocked; whatsoever a man soweth, *that* shall he also reap? Wha means St. James in the quoted words, "Faith without *works* is dead"? *"Works"* is the exact equivalent of the word *Karma,* than which Clutton-Brock thinks "nothing could be more contrary to the most profound part o Christ's teachings." Perhaps he has lost his way in that profundity. Wha means Krishna, Even if the man of *most evil ways* shall worship the Spiri with exclusive devotion, he is to be considered as righteous, for he *has judged aright,* and such a man *soon becometh of a righteous disposition and enjoys enduring happiness?* What means Buddha by the Noble Four-fold Path— that the cause of man's misery and sorrow is within himself and can be cured by him alone? What means H. P. B. by repeating hundreds of times tha Theosophy is "the gospel of hope and responsibility;" that each man is the *continuing* arbiter of his own destiny; that no God can save him, no Devi persecute him, but that each is his own god and his own devil; that man and every other being has evolved, *is evolving, and will forever continue to evolve,* that the universe is *embodied consciousness,* never for a single instant a "static universe;" that man ascends through all degrees of intelligence from lowest to highest only by *self*-induced and *self*-devised efforts (*aided or hindered* as the case may be by the results of his own past actions) with no privileges or special gifts save those won by himself throughout a long series of metempsychoses and reincarnations?